



## United States Mission to the OSCE

### **Statement by U.S. Permanent Representative Ambassador Julie Finley**

As delivered at the morning session  
of the High Level Consultations, Vienna  
September 13, 2005

Thank you Mr. Chairman:

I have listened very attentively to the comments of other delegations.

My comments will deal with all of the topics on the agenda this morning.

In the topics under discussion at this session, there are a number of concepts of importance to the United States; ideas that we can support; or ideas that we view as sufficiently interesting to warrant further, more detailed, examination this fall.

These include:

#### **OSCE Field Operations**

We strongly support the maintenance of field presences with broad mandates that enable them to respond to changing needs and requirements, including at the request of the host country, without requiring new mandates.

In accord with the concept of comprehensive security, we support having presences assist host countries in all three OSCE dimensions, wherever appropriate. Field presences should have the personnel and financial resources to work effectively on a broad range of activities across the three dimensions.

We support making all mission mandates at least one year in duration.

We strongly support development of revised local staff salaries that would enable all field presences to attract and retain qualified local staff. This would also help develop domestic expertise in presence-hosting countries.

We support efforts to provide field operations with specialized support from OSCE institutions, particularly in relation to all phases of capacity-building projects, including more effective use of short-term staff visits.

To help stabilize the personnel system in order to better retain qualified and experienced personnel, we support making contracts one year, rather than the current six months.

We are prepared to consider establishment of thematic missions, but that might be a task for consideration next year.

### **OSCE functioning in the politico-military dimension**

We continue to support a strong politico-military dimension that fulfills the comprehensive security mandate of the OSCE.

A key element of this dimension should be implementation of commitments.

We support enhancing efforts to deal with 21st Century threats.

We would like to see better use made of the pol-mil dimension to support field missions, resolve frozen conflicts, address sub-regional tensions, and support OSCE work in other dimensions.

### **The Economic and Environmental Dimension**

We think that OSCE can do a lot more to promote economic development by assisting states in improving domestic institutions and structures that are critical to encouraging investment - domestic and foreign. The greatest expertise that OSCE has, related to the Economic Dimension, is in the sphere of good governance.

We are open to considering elevating the status of the Economic and Environmental Coordinator to that of an institution, to give it a higher profile and greater authority, and to put it on equal footing with the other two dimensions.

### **Human Dimension**

We strongly support maintaining the three institutions' autonomy and capacity to operate independently within their mandates and the bounds of broad OSCE goals and principles. Their projects and activities should not be subject to Permanent Council control.

We will support reform initiatives that further strengthen ODIHR's ability to assist participating States in implementing their existing Human Dimension commitments. While we support efforts to increase work in the Pol/Mil and Economic Dimensions, we will not agree to do so at the expense of the OSCE's Human Dimension activities.

We support ODIHR work to enhance governments' post-election follow up, including the provision of increased OSCE assistance.

We support OSCE strengthening its work on tolerance and non-discrimination, mainstreaming this theme into all its activities, institutions, and field missions. In order to do this, the ODIHR Tolerance Program requires a larger core budget.

We can consider new commitments on election technology, but we will not agree to open up the existing Copenhagen commitments for revision.

We can consider revising the HDIM modalities, including occasionally moving its location, but we are not ready to commit to tinkering with the timeline.

We support continuing the current three Personal Representatives on tolerance-related issues, under their current mandates, until the end of 2006. We are prepared to consider new structures or procedures for addressing the issues within their mandates, to take effect at the beginning of 2007.

### **Operational Capacities of the OSCE**

On a case-by-case basis, we will support proposals that genuinely enhance the capacities of the OSCE to prevent and respond to conflict and promote development of civil societies, democracy, freedom, security, and prosperity.

If the Secretariat, field missions and OSCE's institutions can be better funded, staffed, and positioned to meet these goals, then we would likely support those reform proposals.

As already noted yesterday, we can support the proposal to grant legal privileges and immunities for OSCE staff.

We support finding ways to improve coordination and communication between various Secretariat components. This can be achieved without major changes to the system or weakening any of the activities of institutions.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to note some ideas or proposals that my government cannot support. These include:

Concerning field presences, we do not support subordinating field presences to the Secretary General for their normal operations (except for management functions).

We do not support removing from the Chairmanship the authority and responsibility for appointing Heads and Deputy Heads of presences.

We will not agree to establishment of PC control over extra-budgetary contributions and projects.

We do not support making presence Heads and Deputy Heads contracted, rather seconded, positions. To increase the possibility of access to such positions for personnel from states that are unable to pay competitive salaries, we are prepared to consider the establishment of a voluntary diversification fund, to help such states provide candidates.

In the political-military dimension, we oppose reopening past documents and commitments. We are willing to consider stand alone decisions that update or refine specific elements, but only if there is a clear need and value added.

We are against negotiating new traditional style arms control/CSBMs, although we MAY be willing to consider specific proposals if there is a clear security need to be addressed.

We are against opening duplicate negotiations of issues, e.g., on WMD, already being negotiated elsewhere. We are open to appropriate OSCE reinforcing measures.

In the Economic and Environmental Dimension, we do not support simply holding more, and longer, conferences. The content and substance of meetings and activities, not their number and length, will determine how meaningful and relevant the dimension is.

In the Human Dimension, we will not agree to subordination of the institutions to the Secretariat or any other OSCE body.

We will not agree to eliminate Election Observation Mission Heads' ability to report on preliminary findings immediately after elections, nor will we support having ODIHR or EOM statements made subject to PC-approval.

Mr. Chairman, my comments today have not addressed all of the ideas on the very extensive list of proposals that have been put forward in recent months. There may be other proposals that we could support or at least consider, either this year or in the future.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.